In the Drawings

Applicant submits herein Amended Drawings of Figures 1 and 6 as Replacement Drawings to Figures 1 and 6 as originally filed.

Applicants Response to Examiner's Comments

Drawings

Examiner objects to Figure 1 as failing to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols as described in the specification. Applicant submits herein Amended Drawings of Figures 1 and 6 as Replacement Drawings to Figures 1 and 6 as originally filed, wherein textual labels have been added to Figure 1 and Figure 2 is clarified to identify the first preferred embodiment of the method of the present invention as element 5.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Amended Figure 1 as enclosed and submitted herein address Examiner's objections and are fully in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84.

Claim Objections

Examiner objects to Claims 5-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Examiner holds that Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Examiners states that claims 5-8 depend on the "data structure of claim 1" while claim 1 as originally filed recites a "computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure" claim.

Applicant replies that Claims 5-8 as currently amended recite dependence from the computer-readable medium of Claim 1, rather than from a "data structure".

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Examiner's objections to Claims 5-8 have been fully and satisfied addressed by the currently amended Claims .x as submitted herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Examiner rejects Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Examiner rejects Claims 1-4 and 9 because the term "computer-readable medium" is not limited to tangible medium in Paragraph 0102 of the Specification as originally filed, but rather

includes an acoustic or light wave as a form of "computer-readable medium". Applicant responds that the Specification as currently amended herein has reduced the definition of computer-readable medium to not include acoustic or light wave, and that the definition of computer-readable medium as currently amended is therefore limited to tangible media and is in accordance with the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, published on 26 October 2005.

Examiner rejects Claim 10 for being directed to "computer system" claim but cites no hardware limitation. Applicant responds that Claim 10 as currently amended herein includes the elements of a controller and a memory that are communicatively coupled and that the statutory hardware limitation is thereby fulfilled.

Applicant respectfully therefore submits that the Claims 1-10 as currently amended satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Examiner rejects Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102 paragraph (e) as being anticipated by a Patent Application by Millet, et al. (Publication 2003/0154197).

Applicant directs Examiner's attention to the accompanying Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, wherein Applicant submits an attestation and supporting documentation that Applicant's data of invention is antecedent to that of Millet, et al., and that Millet et al. is therefore not Prior Art as required under 35 U.S.C. 102 paragraph (e). The two manuals respectively entitled ExtraView Adminstrator's Guide and ExtraView Schema attached hereto were published prior to the filing date of February 12, 2003 of Millet, et al. (Publication 2003/0154197). The enclosed revision of the ExtraView Adminstrator's Guide was published on July 24, 2001 and the enclosed revision of the ExtraView Schema was published on September 15, 2001.

Regarding Claim 1, Examiner states that Millet et al. teach of a "computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure, the data structure having first user-defined field, or first "UDF", the first UDF associated with a record stored in a table" (see Abstract, [0040], [0048] and Fig. 13 wherein "Custom Field Values" data table is equivalent to Applicant's "data structure" and each of its records is equivalent to Applicant's "UDF"), the first UDF comprising:

"an identifier of the record" (see [0042], [0044], [0048], [0054] and Fig. 13 wherein "Row 10" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language);

"an identifier of the first UDF" (see [0048] and Fig. 13 wherein "Field 10" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language); and

"a first datafield, whereby the first datafield is associated with the record and additional information may be stored in the first datafield and associated with the record and without modification of the table" (see [0048], Fig. 13 and Fig. 15 wherein "Value" or "FieldValue" datafield is equivalent to data field as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [0014] and [0061]).

Applicant replies that the reference of Millet et al. as cited by the Examiner is not Prior Art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and that Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 2, Examiner states that the Claim 2 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the computer-readable medium further comprises a metadata, the metadata associated with the first UDF, and the metadata comprising a classification of data type, the classification of data type distinguishing the data type of the additional information stored in the first datafield" (see [0048], [0056] and Fig. 10 wherein attribute information is equivalent to Applicant's "metadata", the type of data in the field is equivalent to Applicant's "classification of data type"; also see [0041] and [0073]).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 2 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 3, Examiner states that the Claim 3 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the computer-readable medium further comprises a metadata, the metadata associated with the first UDF, and the metadata comprising a name, the name associated with the first UDF and the name for use in software operations accessing the first UDF" (see [0048], [0056] and Fig. I 0 wherein field attribute information store in "Custom

35.

Fields" table is equivalent to Applicant's "metadata associated with the first UDF", and field name such as "Memo" is associated with a custom field or UDF as illustrated in Applicant's claim language;

also see [0073]).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 3 depends from the indepenedent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 4, Examiner states that the Claim 4 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim I and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the computer-readable medium further comprises a metadata, the metadata associated with the first UDF, and the metadata comprising a title, the title associated with the first UDF and the name for use in a visual display of the additional information of the first UDF (see [0056] wherein field attribute information in "Custom Fields" table is equivalent to Applicant's "metadata associated with the first UDF", and "text associated with that field" is

equivalent to title as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 4 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 5, Examiner states that the Claim 5 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the data structure further comprises a class plurality of UDF's and the first datafield comprises a class identifier of the class plurality of UDF's" (see [0048], Fig. 12 and Fig.15 wherein set of custom fields associated with each database table within the RDBMS is equivalent to Applicant's "a class plurality of UDF's", and "TableID" or "ValueID" is equivalent to Applicant's "class identifier") ,and each UDF of the class plurality comprising:

"the class identifier" (see Fig. 10-12 wherein "TableID" is equivalent Applicant's claim language);

"a unique identifier of the UDF of the class plurality of UDF's" (see Fig. 10 wherein "FieldID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language);

"a datafield, whereby each datafield of the class plurality of UDF's may be associated with the first UDF and therefrom associated with the record, and information may be stored in the plurality of datafields of the class plurality of UDF's and associated with the first UDF's, and therefrom the information ofthe plurality of datafields of the class plurality of UDF's may be associated with the record and without modification of the table (see Fig. 10, and Fig 13 wherein records of table in Fig. 10 is equivalent to Applicant's "the class plurality of UDF's", each record of table in Fig. 13 is equivalent to Applicant's "first UDF", the "FieldID" in both table indicates the association between two table or the association between the class plurality of UDF's and the first UDF as in Applicant's claim language, the "RowID" in table of Fig. 13 indicates the association between that table and the database table, or, in other words, the association between a UDF and class plurality of UDF's with records in the database table as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [0057]).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 5 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 6, Examiner states that the Claim 6 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the data structure further comprises a plurality of UDF' s" (see Fig. 15 and [0057] wherein "Custom Field Values" table is equivalent to Applicant's "data structure" and its records is equivalent to Applicant's "a plurality of UDF's"), each UDF comprising":

"an identifier of the first UDF" (see Fig. 15 wherein "FieldID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language);

"a unique identifier of one of the plurality of UDF's" (see Fig. 5 wherein "ValueID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language); and

"a datafield, whereby the plurality of datafields are associated with the first UDF and information may be stored in the plurality of datafields and associated with the first UDF and therefrom the information of the plurality of datafields may be associated with the record and without modification of the table" (see Fig. 5 and [0057]-[0058] wherein "RecordID" is equivalent to "datafield" as illustrated in Applicant's claim language since "RecordID" is a primary/foreign key which allows connecting record to another record which includes plurality of datafields; also see [0046]).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 6 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 7, Examiner states that the Claim 7 rejection is based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the identifier of the record is a pointer" (see Fig. 13, [0048] and [0054] wherein "RowID" (equivalent to Applicant's "the identifier of the record") is also a pointer because it points to location of the record in the table).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 7 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"wherein the data structure further comprises a plurality of user defined fields, or plurality of "UDF's", each UDF associated with a record stored in a table" (Fig. 15 and [0057] wherein "Custom Field Values" table is equivalent to Applicant's "data structure" and its records is equivalent to Applicant's "a plurality of UDF's"), each UDF comprising":

"an identifier of the record" (see Fig, 15 wherein "RecordID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language);

"a unique identifier of one of the plurality of UDF's" (see Fig. 5 wherein "FieldID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language); and

"a datafield, whereby the plurality of datafields are associated with the record and information may be stored in the plurality of datafields and associated with the first UDF and therefrom the information of the plurality of datafields may be associated with the record and without modification of the table" (see Fig. 5 and [0057]-[0058] wherein "ValueID" is equivalent to "datafield" as illustrated in Applicant's claim language since "ValueID" is a primary/foreign key which allows connecting record to another record which includes plurality of datafields; also see [0046]).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 8 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 9 Examiner further states that Millet et al. teach:

"A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure, the data structure having a record, a list and a list user-defined field, or List "UDF", the List UDF relatable to the record" (see [0041], [0048] and Fig. 15 wherein a table is a list of records, and any custom field associated with the table is equivalent to Applicant's "list user-defined field"), and the List UDF comprising:

"an identifier of the List UDF" (see Fig. 10 wherein "FieldID" is equivalent to Applicant's claim language);

"an identifier of the List" (see Fig. 10 wherein "TableID" is equivalent to Applicant's"claim language"); and

"a data address of the List, whereby an information stored at the data address of the List is associated with the List UDF and the information may be stored or modified at the data address of the list and the information may be associated with the record and without modification of the table" (see [0073] and [0074] wherein the second values table as disclosed is equivalent to the List and the disclosure of retrieval of information from the table implies the inclusion of some data address to access table from its storage).

Applicant respectfully replies that Claim 9 depends directly from the independent and allowable Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

Regarding Claim 10, Examiner states that Millet et al. teach:

"A computer system" (see Abstract) comprising:

"a software database having data organized into a table of records" (see [0041]);

"a user-defined field for associating a datum with a record of the table, the user defined field having a UDF identifier and a record identifier" (see [0048], [0073] and Fig. 13 and Fig.15 wherein "FieldID" is equivalent to Applicant's "UDF identifier", and "RowID" or "RecordID" is equivalent to Applicant's "record identifier");

"a metadata associated with the user-defined field and the metadata specifying the data type of the datum" (see [0056] and Fig. 10 wherein field attribute information is equivalent to metadata as illustrated in Applicant's claim language); and

"a database manager software program for merging the user-defined field with the record to associate the datum of the user-defined field with the record of the table" (see [0061] wherein the application allowing user to add data column as necessary as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "database manager software program").

Applicant replies that the reference of Millet et al. as cited by the Examiner is not Prior Art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and that Claim 10 is therefore allowable.

In summation, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections to the Claims have been fully resolved by the Claims as currently amended. Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections of the Claims have been fully traversed by scope and recitations of the Claims as currently amended, and that the Claims are therefore allowable.

If any matters can be resolved by telephone, Applicant requests that the Patent and Trademark Office call the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

50.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Patrick T. Reilly
Reg. No. 37,427

Patrick Reilly
Patent Attorney
Box 7218
Santa Cruz, CA 95061-7218
(831) 332-7127